



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

# AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

---

VOL. XXXV, 4.

WHOLE No. 140.

---

## I.—CAESAR, CICERO AND FERRERO.

### I.

Νᾶφε καὶ μέμνας' ἀπιστεῖν' ἄρθρα ταῦτα τᾶν φρενῶν.

—Epicharmos.

“Be sober and to doubt prepense:

These are the sinews of good sense”.

—Sir William Hamilton.

Many things have been capitalized among us, of which Bishop Berkeley made no prophecy—but scholarship certainly is not one of them. On the concerns of the latter one who has spent more than eight *lustra* on such non-material pursuits, may write, I trust, without reserve and without any fear that his motives may be misunderstood. I must not here digress on the problem of the present prospects of classicism nor on that great and urgent theme, viz. the rehabilitation of Greek in America. But there is one simple and far-reaching cultural truth which I cannot, nay, must not suppress in this prooemium of a very serious study. What *are* the actual motives to stimulate and maintain wide as well as searching reading of classical texts? For it is the *texts* (often fairly buried under the strata of successive erudition) that we must cling to. Even whenever the ancient controversy between *Sachphilologie* and *Wortphilologie* is kindled afresh, even when the great figures of Boeckh and of Gottfried Hermann loom up once more in the historical perspective of our studies—, even there the simple appeal to the *texts* seems to make for peace. Now it is perhaps not necessary, perhaps not even wise, to insist too

much on the distinction and discrimination between *matter* and *manner*. Did any form ever clothe a subject with such exquisite and puzzling felicity as the hexameter contained and transmitted the splendid legends of Gods and Men in the Greek epic, or the distich of Greek elegy commemorated the mighty dead, or present the monition of lasting verities, or where is there anything more directly symbolical than that swift measure, the Iambus, the projectile so to speak, of the invective of Archilochus? I do believe, however, that the more delicate sense of *form* is not very often laid in the cradle of any favored mortal, whether for the actual production of verse or for the sympathetic interpretation thereof.

Quem tu, Melpomene, semel  
Nascentem placido lumine videris . . .

but these are few and far between—*pauci quos aequus amavit*. It is, according to my lights, the *historical* concern, which postulates, which begets wide reading. It is this strain of interest, I believe, which will carry us far beyond the beaten and narrow range of didactic limitation and academic preserves. It is here, particularly, that we of the western world have been too long content to abide in a certain (mainly meek and receptive) attitude towards Europe and towards transatlantic production in general. But even among us a new day is dawning. Generous editions of certain lives of Plutarch, searching studies in Roman legislation and institutions, a delineation of Athens in the Hellenistic period and other works have appeared here in these latter years. Classic Grammar has achieved for itself, in America, a very positive and distinguished autonomy. May we not hope that a similar maturity may soon be recorded in many other fields of classical scholarship? *Ne multa*, the time has gone by when we will accept either work or the valuation of work coming to us from abroad without proper or competent examination of our own, or be content with reprinting or translating European books dealing with the classical world. It was this particular sentiment and reflection, which guided my pen, when some three years ago I wrote as follows: “. . . . . may I not express a hope (not oversanguine it is true), that our British and Continental fellow-classicists may begin at least to realize, that first-hand classical study on this side of the Atlantic has reached a point of earnestness, a stage

of exact and sustained effort which may deserve some attention from them too, and some return for the European pupilage, which among us is rapidly coming to an end".<sup>1</sup>

Such too were some of the sentiments very much alive within me, when I began to undertake a close and searching examination of a work, which, if it were true and correct, might permit us to lay aside Mommsen and Drumann and even Ludwig Lange.—No one can dispute or belittle the concrete, material, commercial success of Guglielmo Ferrero's *History of Rome from Sulla downward*. 'David Harum' probably netted much more for its author, not to recall the *Waverley* novels. *Nous autres* of course, whose choice of life and labor has been made long ago (and with a clear vision of the unworldliness of genuine scholarship)—*we* would hardly be ready or willing to echo valuations or appreciations evoked or determined largely by commercial success and bound up with all the familiar devices of publicity campaigns executed within the domain of modern journalism; for that is the soil in which factitious fame will grow fairly over night, like shoots of bamboo in East India in a certain season of the year. A work as comprehensive as Ferrero's postulates so wide a familiarity with, so constant a recurrence to, classical texts, that it may well be examined in some detail from the standpoint of classical scholarship. As to the non-scholarly qualities of the work, (some of the most salient are such) and the literary devices to hold the general reader, and as regards the underlying *Weltanschauung* of this enterprising writer, these will be brought to the surface in due time. I must, however, before I begin, say, and say it with the utmost deliberateness, that, as regards the assurance of unsupported affirmation, the setting aside of the results of examination and sifting and weighing made by a long series of eminent minds and infinitely painstaking observers,—as regards the beribboning and tricking out of many bare spots in the actual tradition with a meretricious make-believe of clear lines, bright pigments and a positive *haut relief* of figures—in all these respects, I say, I must write it down here that I have never read a more pretentious work.

When one soberly surveys, when one later on begins to study the fragments, and the sadly inadequate documents

<sup>1</sup> *Annals of Caesar*. 1911. Preface, p. viii.

which in the main constitute Mommsen's "Trümmerfeld der Ueberlieferung", then one is reminded, nay, sharply admonished over and over again, not to forget that *Tenth Muse*, nay, that veritable *paredros* of Kleio herself to which Quintilian adverts (though in another connection), "*Est quaedam ars nesciendi*". It is true the correspondence of Cicero, from 68 down to 43 B. C. throws a light, paralleled nowhere else in ancient history, upon a period fairly conterminous with the latter disintegration and final collapse of what we have been accustomed to call the Roman Republic. Further it is a welcome coincidence that the connected and continuous tradition of Cassius Dio (so largely the preserver of Livy) begins for us almost at the same point of time. It is impossible to mention Cicero's correspondence without naming Tyrrell (and Purser) also. One of the most inexcusable faults (shall I say of commission or omission?) of Ferrero is this that he has not had Tyrrell's Cicero at his elbow throughout, that he is virtually ignorant of this primary and indispensable work, and unacquainted with the fair and precise characterizations of almost every personality of note occurring in that age. . . As for myself, it is to me a source of lasting gratification that my independent study of this period has brought me, in the main, to conceptions or valuations very largely identical with those of Robert Yeverton Tyrrell. No one who has even slightly honored my things with any interest but knows that I would be the last to copy or transcribe anything except the ancient sources and these too only with a clear estimate of their relative dignity, substance and authenticity. For in endeavoring, with Ranke, to determine, "*wie es denn eigentlich gewesen ist*", we learn, while leaving no stone unturned, how to come pretty close to things, situations and minds, and we actually seem to ascend to the purer ether above the region of mists, clouds and storms, where objective historiography dwells. And I beg to append here a small but precious item from Ranke's life, for it contains or suggests the principles and methods which I am following in my critique of Ferrero. It was in 1824. Ranke was just then occupied with the preparation of his "*Geschichten der romanischen und germanischen Völker*". The young historian was about 29 years old. 'Quentin Durward' had come out in the year before (1823). Ranke (like Sir Walter

Scott) had been reading the memoirs of Commynes: "Mein Gott",—soll er sich gesagt haben,—"Commynes und die andern Relationen haben das ja ganz anders!". . . . . "Ich war gleichsam beleidigt im Namen der alten Fuersten, denen er andere Gesinnung zuschreibt als sie hegten,<sup>1</sup> immer unter ihren Namen. Ich empfand Widerwillen gegen den historischen Roman, namentlich in dieser Annaeherung an die Begebenheiten, und fasste den Beschluss, dass in der Historie alles vermieden werden müsse, was von der beglaubigten Ueberlieferung der Thatsachen wesentlich abweicht". . . . . "In der Hauptsache und im Kern der Darstellung daran festzuhalten, was sie (die Schriftsteller) ueberliefern, dass ist für mich ein unverrückbares Gesetz". Or let us hear of Niebuhr (ib. p. 19): "Die peinliche Gewissenhaftigkeit mit der Niebuhr lehrte, sich bei jedem Schritte mit der Ueberlieferung auseinanderzusetzen, hier sich von derselben zu entfernen, dort dieselbe festzuhalten, und immer mit Gruenden die sich aus den Quellen ergaben die Quellen zu bekaempfen,—darin lag offenbar ein neues, was auf den ganzen Betrieb befruchtend und umgestaltend eingewirkt hat".

In undertaking the present study I desired not only to exhibit the inner structure and substance of a work so largely dealing with the decisive epoch of Caesar and Cicero, but perhaps even to contribute a little towards advancing and quickening classical historiography in the United States, and not less so because I find myself somehow ἐπὶ γῆραος οὐδῶ. I have a positive horror of hasty and subjective judgments and so I took pains to read and weigh a very great number of reviews and critiques of Ferrero. Notable among them was a study by Maurice Besnier in the *Revue Historique* of 1907, an appreciation marked by those admirable qualities of the French genius, to wit: lucidity and pointedness. Besnier (writing in Paris I believe) calls Ferrero "Un des historiens les plus en vue de l'heure présente".—He says also: "M. Ferrero n'a reculé devant aucune audace". Further he observes that Ferrero "wishes to discover in the facts the justification of a system" (i. e. a materialistic and mechanical conception of history)—(p. 57): "Where everything is determined by eco-

<sup>1</sup> Italics by E. G. S.—cf. 'Leopold von Ranke' by Ottokar Lorenz, Berlin, 1891, p. 15.

nomic necessity"—that "the struggle of classes is pursued without truce or mercy".—"Un mécanisme brutal détermine l'enchaînement des faits et l'action des individus".—The "masses" determine everything.—This mechanism of unconscious factors and forces is a doctrine, says Besnier, 'so convenient, easy and simple'. We may add here that anyone who can follow a newspaper article or a magazine sketch, can follow Ferrero with consummate ease and can appropriate the underlying social philosophy with the same ease; in fact we may say that Ferrero makes no greater demands on the intellectual collaboration of his readers than a novelist would, that is to say, none at all.—I find myself also in complete harmony with the following utterance of Besnier (p. 60): "L'historien doit se soucier uniquement des événements eux-mêmes et des rapports de cause à effet qui les unissent; se cantonnant sur le terrain solide des réalités contingentes, il abandonne aux spéculations des théologiens et des philosophes le domain imprécis des possibilités transcendantes".—"L'infinie complexité des faits ne se laisse pas ramener à une formule unique et sommaire d'explication" (p. 61). Further, Besnier says that Ferrero is a literary representative of "modernisme à outrance", that he strives to present everything in a novel way, "to rejuvenate the subject-matter which he treats", but that, in his itch for originality he jeopardizes the greater quality of being true. Besnier (p. 67) utters the sound monition: "*les textes, nos seuls guides sûrs*". As to the style of Ferrero: Ce jeu d'antithèses n'explique rien et sent un peu la rhétorique".<sup>1</sup>—"Le principal défaut de M. Ferrero, c'est l'exagération". Besnier notes Ferrero's "généralisations téméraires"—and also says: "insensiblement nous passons des faits certains aux déductions hypothétiques". It seems Paris was more appreciative of the young author than Turin, Florence or Rome. Among the earlier critics was Antonio Abruzzese of Padua, who in the *Revista di Storia Antica* (1903, pp. 187-200) dealt particularly with the phenomenon of artificial modernization, a paper of which I beg to excerpt a few utterances: "non manca di una certa fresca e moderna audacia" (187); "un acuto sapore di odiernissima novità". . .

<sup>1</sup> If Ferrero is rated a great historian among his original guild, the journalists, it is even more probable that he is esteemed a very effective journalist in the judgment of sober historians.

"la grande sicurezza delle sue affermazioni". A critical phrase of Henri Weil is utilized (189): "la désinvolture irrévérencieuse d'un journaliste". Abruzzese utterly denies the utility, nay the historical justification of the incessant parallelisms with today and yesterday, the virtual identification of Now and Then, of things or figures so remote, as when Sulla is actually compared with ——— Washington, or Cato with ——— Dante. Abruzzese properly holds that a historian has no warrant to equip distant figures with the modes or fashions of sentiment and thought of the actual men of the moment, for of what value or pertinency it is to say that ancient militarism "corresponded" (whatever that may mean) to modern industrialism? A. also refers to the emphasis laid on psychiatry.<sup>1</sup> In conclusion the Paduan scholar calls Ferrero's book the work of a "talented publicist". No doubt of that.

At the age of twenty-one or twenty-two young Ferrero was a reporter of criminal cases and criminal trials in different parts of Italy. Soon, with other criminological feuilletonists like Sighele and Bianchi, he began to publish, in a light and pleasing style, a series of pieces dealing with remarkable cases under the title of 'Il Mondo Criminale Italiano'. Evidently when a mere youth he was a clever and one may say a very precocious person. The journalist's trick (so much in evidence in his history) of catchy titles and superscriptions he revealed even then. Thus a report of a prisoner's crime was by the subtitle: "La Famiglia dei Borgia"; another where a nun had embezzled moneys collected for charities was headed thus: "I Fioretti di S. Francesco e una novella del Boccaccio in Tribunale". His criminological observations he expanded into sociological reflections with a glib assurance of generalization in so young a person which takes one's breath away. He was greatly influenced by the psychiatric theses of Lombroso. If one were to try to characterize this earlier journalism and the tendencies there revealed, one might say that here we have a reporter of twenty-two, who elaborates his reports of criminal cases in a quasi-novelistic way, deriving the given concrete act from underlying social conditions, largely elimi-

<sup>1</sup>F. is a son-in-law of Cesare Lombroso, and jointly with the latter brought out a criminological book in which among other exhibits the skull of Charlotte Corday is presented, as predetermining, somehow, her killing of Marat.



nating the principle of personal moral responsibility, and jumping at conclusions and generalizations of the most sweeping character. Thus at twenty-two he compares Leo Tolstoy with ——— St. Francis of Assisi: “tanti in realtà (glib *realità*) sono i punti di simiglianza tra i due riformatori, religiosi—l’italiano di *cinque* secoli sono e il russo di questi giorni”. Very taking these parallels in a young journalist but quite unhistorical, and when subjected to a searching examination, quite inept. The assassination of President Carnot of France in 1894 (F. was 22) promptly induced him to generalize on political murder and also to tempt him to begin his quest of international fame by getting an article of his (cited by himself as “*Die politische Mord*”) published in a Vienna magazine. Listen to a piece of the youth’s ethics: “Ma in fondo la vera genesi del delitto si deve ricercare *in quella legge psico-sociologica*, secondo la quale la morale politica è nella sua evoluzione *sempre* (he is very fond of this adverb) in ritardo sulla morale individuale”. We perceive the matchless audacity in leaping at generalization which incessantly annoys us in his later work. Further we observe even at this earlier stage that chronic seeking and prompt finding of parallels which are to arrest or entertain the reader of the feuilleton, but whether this habit of arbitrary approximation furnishes any true insight may well be doubted.

Only seven years after these criminological and sociological papers of his youth Ferrero at twenty-nine (1901) put out the first volume of his new work, the challenge of Mommsen, Drumann and Lange, not to speak of Merivale or George Long, of which latter scholars F. apparently is ignorant. One may cudgel one’s brain as to the precise bearing of “*Grandezza e Decadenza*”. Where does the *Grandezza* begin and where the *Decadenza*? Or are they perhaps correlated like light and shade in a work of Rembrandt? At last it dawned on my slow and old-fashioned intelligence, I could joyously cry out with the famous scientist of Syracuse: *εῦρηκα! εῦρηκα!* A catchy title often like a girl’s pretty face or well placed curl even, is a new book’s fortune or half fortune: Montesquieu and Gibbon like Samuel when cited by the witch of Endor, slowly rose up before my critical gaze, now I had it at last.

“Ich sei, gewahrt mir die Bitte,  
In Eurem Bunde der Dritte”!

And when finally I saw the personal signature of the newly fledged historian of Rome appended to the first volume as a guarantee of authenticity no less than a symbol of the author's deep sense of his achievement, then Horace at once occurred to me and that profound conviction of excellence bravely uttered to all time, which indeed is the very hallmark of classicity:

Exegi monumentum aere perennius,  
Quod non imber edax non aquilo impotens  
Possit diruere etc. etc.

But if we are to take the work seriously, we must at least resume our habitual seriousness. All the ensuing notes deal with the Italian original (Fratelli Treves, Milano), for when one examines an important object one must avoid translations; one must not, perhaps standing on tiptoe, look at the object under examination through a window or screen.

To begin with, I am not sure whether the journalistic habits of the author help or hinder his historiography. Everything, every person, incident and particularly that algebraic symbol of sociological collective terminology, the *class*, appears actual, real, palpable, concrete—: i. e. the way he presents them. Often however we simply have no data in our texts, not the faintest warrant for such plastic definiteness, least of all for such *à tout prix* modernity. Then he fills in with sociological or psychological construction or invention, proceeding precisely in the fashion of a dramatist or novelist. Like an aviator he floats into space, leaving the terra firma of ascertained or ascertainable facts.

May I say a word here on the entire subject of *approximation*? Is it not a gigantic assumption to start in with the thesis of the substantial identity of human things and social consciousness at periods vastly remote from one another? It is, to speak plainly, simply not true nor tenable, that our own vision and perspective, our own set of political and social notions may be safely or properly projected or injected into the "ancient world" (a vague term of rather arbitrary generalization) or into ancient minds or individual persons, let alone classes, or what as a matter of academic convenience or convention we may be pleased to call social consciousness. Take the idea of a broad or common *humanity* (essentially unrecognized before the Stoics and not too firmly by them) or take the wider application

of international law, take finally the incomparable and positively regenerative influence of Christianity, (vastly more important than the introduction of the Latin language and the Roman civil law into western Europe)—the greatest revolution (no evolution at all, as Paulsen expressed it) in universal history. The categories of Compté and Buckle are entirely unavailing here. The *humanity* of the Stoics is one thing, the humanity of St. Paul radically broader and deeper, while the cultural and conceited humanity of the Italian Renaissance again was something quite apart. No one should utter very broad judgments on social or human consciousness in classical antiquity who has not deeply read in Pausanias the *Periegete*. The 'religions' of the teeming Hellenic communities as well as of Rome were a very narrow thing, consisting largely of certain anniversaries; often merely commemorating some specific 'hero' in the pedigree of the given community; but all of these political units, each by itself faced the rest of the world with what we may call a distinctly *ethnic* or *regional*, not in any degree or manner with a *social* or *general human* consciousness—of these things young Ferrero had hardly any perception at all when he entered on so large and so bold an enterprise. Europe and the United States today have a unity of ideas of civilization comparable in compactness and definiteness to the unity of a single state and this through weight and efficacy much superior to the ideas held by any single state at any time of the past. No such set of ideas existed in the Mediterranean world in Caesar's time. The very term or political idea of *annexation* as foisted by Ferrero into the relation he gives of Caesar's conquest of Gaul, is inept, because essentially modern, as though it were a kind of defiance of our own international consciousness. A mere skimming of Cicero's *de provinciis consularibus* must reveal an absolutely different set of underlying political ideas.

We deny then at the very outset, any historical warrant whatever for the free use by Ferrero of social categories and of the very terminology of the social things of today and yesterday. We positively question the propriety of the manipulation of these "classes" as actual and conscious political elements, units or forces of Roman history. I can readily see that the *tout comme chez nous* sentiment is enormously convenient and attractive to the greatest possible mass of readers,

of whom less than one per cent would even endure a single antiquarian page culled e. g. from Mommsen's *Staatsrecht* or from Madvig or Lange: but that sociological blanket with its pattern of today and yesterday is not historiography.

If only we could garb Cicero in a frockcoat and put a *pincenez* on his nose: if only we could put a telephone receiver into the hand of the "old banker, Crassus", or have the waiter bring in some Veuve Cliquot for Cleopatra and a box of Havanas for the towering Julius, while he is studying the pattern of the Armenian rug on the mosaic floor and is on the point of citing an appropriate sentiment from Sappho or from Anacreon—if this only could be done, then the whole would be even a little more Ferreresque, a little more modern than it is now: a *little* more, but not indeed very much more. We must then positively decline to follow Ferrero into his shop filled with social labels of to-day and yesterday which he spreads as calmly over that world of Italy and its Mediterranean empire as the housemaid spreads the counterpane when she makes up the beds. It is the journalist who simply goes on using the phrases his pen has long been familiar with, e. g. "cartaginese classi alte e medie, plutocrazia". The very calling of Italy or of the Roman and Latin colonies of the Hannibalian era (I 28) "una vera nazione agricola e aristocratica" is merely a very convenient unit of terminology. What shall we do with the other labels, "il medio ceto", "il medio ceto rustico", "una borghesia nuova di capitalisti milionari" (I 16); the "ceto campagnuolo di tutta Italia". Whence does he derive the phenomena of universal enrichment or universal impoverishment of which we read from time to time? So too "la rivoluzione proletaria" (I 185). It is simply preposterous to "explain", or to pretend to explain the military occupation of Spain by Sertorius, by means of such fancies. It is fairly sufficient merely to quote a few more of these modern labels of the former journalist: "la borghesia Italica", "la borghesia capitalista".—We know that the great financiers of London, New York or Frankfort are often a bit nervous. Therefore Ferrero (I 315) writes of "l'eccitabile mondo della alta finanza". It is naïve, in speaking of the East of the Empire (I 329) to quote or refer to "la classe dei filosofi, degli scienziati", as they might figure in some university town of

modern Europe or in Cambridge, Mass. But let us advert to a very positive, actual and historical thing, which one merely needs to *name*, to see how fanciful albeit how modern, is the so-called struggle of classes and classes for that time. We admit at once that such is the case in the Paris, the Milan, the Lyon and Marseilles, or the Barcelona of to-day, if you like, for since Danton's and Robespierre's day down to Carl Marx or Liebknecht the Red Republic has been and is a potential unit of our time. What then is it that we should merely *name*? The *Clientes* and the *Liberti* of Roman institutions, and the quasi-paternal relation maintained between them and their *patroni*. A Roman senator even in this period of disintegration often had such a relation to Italian municipia, nay even to some one entire province. A quasi-paternal relation, we said. Even in the XII tables the *patronus* was accursed who did an injury to his own *cliens*, as the Roman consciousness is revealed by Vergil.<sup>1</sup> Inept, nay audacious, we must briefly say, to abstract social points and social terms from our own time, and then use them as moulds or standards to make figures and forms for the epoch of Caesar and Cicero. And the institution of slavery meant a certain solidarity for all non-slaves. The sense, not merely of a certain dependency but even of a certain good will and mutual support between *clientes*, *liberti* and *patroni* was by no means extinct in that age and survived, entirely unimpaired, all the fierce contentions of the civil wars. Slavery and the slavery of skilled labor was too strong an element to permit us to conceive very much solidarity for the 'artisan classes' of Ferrero. To go to the bottom of the whole thing there was then no public press nor class journalism, there were no congresses or reunions, no easy and comparatively inexpensive means of travel, no swift telegraph, no universal faculty of reading, to bind such classes together or fill them with a social sense of solidarity. Men were bound in smaller units, as *sodalitas* in town, or of a *vicinitas*, *pagus*, *colonia*, *municipium* in the peninsula at large or *praefectura*, (cf. Quint. Cicero, de Pet. Consulatus 30). Folk in Italy felt themselves as Picentes, or Marsi, or Mar- rucini, or Paeligni, or Brutti, or Campani rather than as mem-

<sup>1</sup>Servius on Aen. 6, 609 *patronus, si clienti fraudem fecerit, sacer esto*—and (we may ignore the traditional etymology): "si enim clientes quasi colentes sunt, patroni quasi patres, tantundem est clientem quantum filium fallere.

bers of a "class". Give Ferrero a little, no matter how isolated, an item; he will write a bright and lively page around it. And even where even such stray item is lacking, the sociological shuttle will none the less move to and fro, with clicking speed, and where textile substance is wanting, will feed itself on—air or clouds. One of his pet doctrines is that Imperialism was begotten by the craving for luxury and by the beginning of the "mercantile era". The Romans conquered and ultimately destroyed Carthage: the most earnest champion for the latter policy was Cato of Tusculum the author of the monograph on Farming. That the vanishing of the Phœnician mercantile state metamorphosed Rome and Italy and produced a "mercantile era" there, I doubt. Neither Ostia nor Puteoli ever became an *entrepôt* for the general distribution of commodities to the mediterranean world at large. Italy probably never had a single port that could vie with Alexandria or Syracuse, perhaps not even with Massilia. Rome I believe never had the commercial-political consciousness of Rhodes or of the later Venice, Holland or Britain. The troubles of the Pirates were chronic and we are bound to infer that Rome did not feel the necessity in the interest of trade to police the seas. We may safely assume that the vast majority of bottoms trading from Gades to Alexandria and Byzantium were not owned by Roman citizens directly. The publicani advanced large sums to the government and contracted not only for the annual tax levy of entire provinces but also for mines, pastures and other collective concessions. In Cicero's day one could acquire shares in certain Spanish mines, and individual Romans enriched themselves by many forms of provincial loans with a high rate of interest. But the equestrian class was after all, not extensive numerically: cf. Quint. Cic. de Petit. Cons. 33 (Tyrrell). 'Iam equitum centuriæ multo facilius mihi diligentia posse teneri videntur: primum cognoscito equites; *pauci enim sunt*'.

An easy survey in that quarter. More incisive and an element of decadence and demoralization were certain deep ulcers or cancers of Greek and oriental immorality which seem to have widely spread among the Roman aristocracy and which a writer like Ferrero, who seems to be more interested in generic than individual features might have emphasized in his

introduction, as on I, p. 59 or p. 72.—Must we not assume that the *Lex Scantinia de Infanda Venere* was somewhat of a dead letter not so very long after 168 B. C. Of young Scipio Aemilianus Polybius (32, 11) writes as follows: πρώτη δέ τις ἐνέπεσεν ὁρμὴ καὶ ζῆλος τῶν καλῶν, τὸ τὴν ἐπὶ σωφροσύνῃ δόξαν ἀναλαβεῖν, καὶ παραδραμεῖν ἐν τούτῳ τῷ μέρει τοὺς κατὰ τὴν αὐτὴν ἡλικίαν ὑπάρχοντας. ὦν δὲ μέγας καὶ δυσέφικτος ὁ στέφανος, εὐθῆρατος ἦν κατ' ἐκείνον τὸν καιρὸν ἐν τῇ Ῥώμῃ διὰ τὴν ἐπὶ τὸ χεῖρον ὁρμὴν τῶν πλείστων. Οἱ μὲν γὰρ εἰς ἐρωμένους τῶν νέων, οἱ δὲ εἰς ἑταίρας ἐξεκέχυντο, πολλοὶ δὲ εἰς ἀκροάματα καὶ πότους καὶ τὴν ἐν τούτοις πολυτέλειαν, ταχέως ἡρπακότες ἐν τῷ Περσικῷ πολέμῳ (with Perseus of Macedon, ending with Pydna 168 B. C.) τὴν τῶν Ἑλλήνων εἰς τοῦτο τὸ μέρος εὐχέρειαν. And from that time to the later period when Cicero counselled with the grief-stricken elder Curio (about 70–68 B. C.) in connection with the unspeakable *liaison* of young Antony and Curio's son (2 Phil. 45)—somewhat less than—but almost a hundred years the decadence of morals and conduct within the Roman aristocracy had proceeded with fearful momentum: *Facilis descensus Averno*. Such symptoms should be emphasized rather than nebulous and intangible generalizations in social or economic spheres. Another label which F. has abstracted from to-day is “the political scepticism of the cultured classes”. It is naïve to project this into Roman conditions and into a highly concentrated and very intense political life which certainly did occupy, nay preoccupy *le classi alte* pretty steadily. We must merely present to our minds the continuous circumvolutions of the electoral machinery and the enormous annual output of the same: two consuls, so and so many praetors, aediles, tribuni plebis, so many adoptions or rejections of *leges* and *plebiscita*, so many *contiones* for *suasio* or *dissuasio*—no one but *le classi alte* were intimately bound up with all this.

I do not believe in Comte: I could not belong to that cult, I do not believe in Buckle. I do not believe that History is chiefly an ebb and flow of billows which can be measured and thus predetermined or predicted, a recurrent exemplification of identical or unvarying social “laws” with a biological substratum. I refuse to accept a philosophy of History which denies all worth to the individual, as a mere incident owing everything to that academic fiction of these latter days, “so-

ciety". It is of this school that Ferrero is a disciple. Things (le cose) move with a fatal necessity: "questo fatale andare delle cose (I 73); per la necessità delle cose" (ib.) ; "il suo fatal cammino verso il dominio mondiale" (I 191). At bottom, or better, on the surface, history is merely a social "decomposition and recomposition", "decomposizione e ricomposizione sociale (I 105). Or: nelle età (note the generic plural) di decomposizione e ricomposizione sociale" (II 260); or: nel disordine di una decomposizione e ricomposizione sociale l'equilibrio spirituale dei partiti e delle classi è così instabile, che etc. (II 293) or: il disordine nascente da una lunga decomposizione e ricomposizione sociale" (II 468). To me it all seems a pathological matter, an academic intrusion into the domain of actual free history, an audacious attempt at performing a kind of revaluation of everything and everybody, with the incubus of a pseudo science, a branch of zoology with certain phenomena of anthropological exudation, whose elements and forces are as substantially identical at all times and periods as are the axioms of physics and chemistry. Academically speaking it is the old contention between the *Weltanschauung* of Democritus and of Plato, or that of Zeno of Kition and of Epicurus.—This dealing with masses and classes emancipates the individual very largely from responsibility or from the elemental power of moral postulates. Ferrero is fond of saying: "*as always happens, when things resemble this*"—forgetting that this glib declaration of parallel or analogy is simply due to his assumption. E. g. "come *sempre* avviene di questi disegni in simili tempi" (I 86); 'come in *ogni età* di decomposizione sociale' (I 103); come *spesso* (I 126); i partiti dei ricchi sono *spesso* così deboli contro i partiti dei poveri (I 147); come *sempre* (sic) nelle consorterie tornate al potere dopo aver vinto una rivoluzione popolare" (p. 183). In the first place Sulla did not overcome any 'people's revolution' at all.—Or: "in parte per il ravvedimento civico, che segue *sempre* (sic) al miglioramento delle condizioni economiche" (212). "La classe colta che *sempre* (sic) si forma nel ceto medio" (213). On Mithridates' attempt to introduce Roman armature: "come *sempre* (sic) avviene di simiglianti tentativi" (228); or when he compares Crassus with the type of Jewish bankers (250).



But we have to pass on to another feature. It is the deep earmarks of journalism, a form of letters which seeks to hold and entertain the reader *à tout prix*, and not allow any indefiniteness, any remoteness of object to cause the interest of the broad average reader to lag or turn away. Thus we have *Texas* (I 15), the *Boers* (21), Italy after 1848 (23), the *United States* (23), una *highlife Italica* (197). Atticus, a *self-made* man of literature (particularly inept and absurd upon even slight examination) (I 32). The "impartial public",—who belonged to this class, for instance?

Crassus a "stockholder" (I 435) (*azionista*). The Triumvirs were "*bosses*" and "*capi di un caucus*" (447). The informer Vettius is simply put into the French class of '*Agent provocateur*' (vol. I 464). Clodius organizes his *Tammany Hall* (I 466). Infinitely easier to pen such a phrase than study Liebenam's books.—"The mercenary *bureaucracy* which governed Pontus" (I 369). All these labels no doubt would be called vigorous journalism, but hardly genuine historiography.—The following paragraph was published in 1891 but is particularly applicable to Ferrero: "Die journalistische Behandlung der politischen Dinge *verdichtet und vergrößert* den Geschmack für historische Erscheinungen und zeitigt einen *Realismus der Auffassung, welcher den Schwerpunkt des Geschehens immer mehr in Aeusserlichkeiten des Lebens verlegt*, während die massenhafte Lectüre von guten und schlechten Romanen ein Bedürfniss von Motivirungen und Beurteilungen erweckt, zu denen sich selbst der kühnste Geschichtschreiber nimmermehr verstehen kann".<sup>1</sup> But Ferrero then had not yet arisen.

But it is time to assume more specifically the point of view of the classicist in dealing with this Italian book. While writing of the epoch of 100 B. C., the age of Marius and Metellus Numidicus, he says (I 121): "*molti* signori si dilettarono di scriver libri, storie, trattati, poesie in Greco o in Latino". Will not Signor Ferrero enumerate and name these "*many*"? Lucilius was then not long dead, Accius an elderly writer of tragedy and as it seems a teacher of Greek and Latin letters. Rutilius Rufus an earnest devotee of the Stoic system. Who are the *molti*?

<sup>1</sup> Ottokar Lorenz, Leopold v. Ranke, 1891, p. 133.

Or again (p. 122): "Every year there were opened, in Rome, in the Latin towns, in the towns of the Allies, new schools of Rhetoric". Is it even necessary to cite the facts? In Rome we know only of the Latin Rhetoric School of Plotius which Cicero was not permitted to frequent,<sup>1</sup> and soon closed by the censorial edict of Domitius and of L. Crassus (92 B. C.). The Greek schools of rhetoric were not interfered with, and we know that in them at this time there dominated the *status*-system devised by Hermagoras—the rest, in Ferrero's paragraph, is simply fervid invention.

Cicero's father bought the house in the Carinae and brought his two sons away from Arpinum, because there was *no* "splendid education" (F., p. 197) in the municipia. Ferrero's broad inference from that much quoted edict (issued by the foremost orator of his time, too), (F. 128, n. 1) is mere affirmation. Young Cicero went to Rome for the soundest of reasons. On the same, p. 128 of F., we read: "more than one ancient student, having sold his MSS of Homer and Plato (which of course at that time were as common as Teubner texts are now) had embarked upon a pirate ship". Novelistic paragraph. The "students" in the schools of the grammatici were very young boys, say between 8–14 years of age. Perhaps the former reporter thinks of the Quartier Latin in Paris or of Russian students in Zürich. Who were the "millionaire parvenus" of that time? does he know any Trimalchios for this epoch? It is true M. Aemilius Scaurus (cons. 115 B. C. and princeps senatus) is much utilized by F. as a clothes-horse for sociological generalizations,<sup>2</sup> but, though in the three generations preceding him this ultra-aristocratic family had been in obscurity through impoverishment, still Scaurus, to the Roman consciousness of Cicero's time, represented the essence of aristocratic distinction. He resembled Sulla in this respect. Ferrero's trick of impressive headings and superscriptions we have noted: "Mario e la grande insurrezione proletaria" (120) is one of the audacious and pretentious titles. As a matter of fact Marius was no more a conscious social reformer than he was a pupil of Rousseau or St. Simon.

<sup>1</sup> Sueton. de Rhet. 2.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Pauly-Wissowa Aemilii, No. 140; cf. M. Gelzer, Die Nobilität der Röm. Republ. Teubner. No date.

He was a man who strove socially upward, married in middle life a Iulia, and became immensely rich. Plutarch (Mar. 28) says expressly that Marius was no politician at all and cut but a poor figure in *contiones*. What he did do in the social line was this: He began the device of securing a lasting provision for his *veterans*.<sup>1</sup> In his ingenium, *vindictiveness* ruled supreme, but he was utterly innocent of social or sociological speculations or policy. It is wide of the mark also (I 171) to speak of "*l'impassibile Sulla*". That dynast who caused the ashes of Marius to be thrown into the Anio, and had Marius Gratidianus put to death after shocking tortures. And one of the most salient strains in his memoirs was the effort to belittle, on every occasion, the military prestige of his old commander.<sup>2</sup>

If then we follow Comte somewhat less and the texts of antiquity very much more, one simple fact stands out above all others: the development of a class of mercenary legionaries attached to those commanders who had or secured the deeper purse—this was among the chief causes of the disintegration of the old city-republic; whereas, at the same time, it positively aided the conservation of that city-republic's patrimonium, viz. the provinces, the empire. To relate all this was the burden, the sad theme of Livy's aging years. We have an impressively wide survey and a setting forth of a large conception in Plutarch Sulla 12 a *passus* comprehensive, earnest, almost pathetic, almost *oratorical* in its fervor (§ 8): ταῦτ' ἐξήλανε Μάριον, ταῦτα—ταῦτα κτέ. There is an intensity here which seems to point to Livy.

When Ferrero reaches Verres, he avails himself of an Italian monograph by Ciccotti, and his own treatment is evidently second hand work. Indeed almost throughout (apart from a partial and fragmentary acquaintance with Cicero's correspondence), we miss everywhere in Ferrero any firm grasp, any close vision of Cicero's books. Nor is he familiar with the career of Cicero preceding the Verrines. What social themes and splendid generalizations would *pro Roscio*

<sup>1</sup> A device in which his example was followed by Sulla, Pompey, Caesar and Augustus.

<sup>2</sup> For an illustration see Plutarch's relation of the battle of Vercellae. Plut., Mar. 25.

*Amerino* have suggested to this facile pen! What would he have made of the wheat-industry of Sicily and the curious complications bound up with it? What of Verres in Syracuse and the progresses of the rose-crowned governor amid his loving provincials! For these three records and documents, Verres in Sicily, Quintus Cicero in Asia, and Marcus Cicero in Cilicia—all due to Cicero's pen, furnish us the only close vision of these things.—The page on Cicero and Hortensius (I 274) is written in his realistic and journalistic manner, but he should have gotten something from Cicero's Brutus. He inspected that important record later when he came to the year 46. To speak of Cicero in 70 B. C. as a "young man in whom was the hope of the Forum" is quite inept. Even in 81 (pro Quintio), he had deliberately begun to measure himself with Hortensius. And in the survey made by Cicero in his sixty-first year he says of that half-decade (75–70 B. C.): "*Cum essem in plurimis causis et in principibus patronis quinquennium fere versatus*" . . . . (Brut. 319). I was greatly disappointed by the slight use which F. has made of the Verrianae.—Lucullus was still in the east, Pompey Consul, Crassus likewise. While the Arpinate was deeply and constantly engaged, mainly in civil litigation, and while in this field more and more he was coming to be *the* patronus of the equestrian class, the great case of Verres placed him in the forefront of current events, and the termination of senatorial monopoly of jury-service was, no doubt, greatly furthered by Cicero's victorious management of that case. It is one of the bald affirmations of F., that the aristocracy from Sulla downward was a mere coterie, ever dwindling in numbers. They certainly up to 59 B. C. did control the government and to them went the great emoluments of the provinces. "*At istorum villae sociorum<sup>1</sup> fidelissimorum plurimis et pulcherrimis spoliis ornatae refertaeque sunt. Ubi pecunias exterarum nationum esse arbitramini, quae nunc omnes egent, cum Athenas, Pergamum, Cyzicum, Miletum, Chium, Samum totamque Asiam, Achaiam, Graeciam, Siciliam tam in paucis villis inclusas videatis*"? (Cic. Verr. 5, 127.) The aristocracy then, in 70 B. C. was still the most influential element in determining the administration both in city and empire.—

<sup>1</sup>The current euphemism for designating the provincials.

Cicero indeed sought not so much to bring down that ancient bulwark of caste as to compel his admission. Caesar indeed, from the beginning with matchless adroitness and consistency laboured for the political discomfiture of the very class to which he belonged by birth. His *social* feeling and consciousness however had simply nothing of Mirabeau in them while Cicero from the start strove, by his mental superiority, to force recognition from the Marcelli, Metelli, Domitii and the rest—whom he had so brilliantly overshadowed when among them, attending grammaticus and rhetor: δι' εὐφρίαν ἐκλάμψας—(Plut. Cic. 2), and when a candidate for his first office, λέγεται νεανειυσάμενος εἰπεῖν, ὡς ἀγωνιέται τὸν “Κικέρωνα” (i. e. the name) τῶν Σκαύρων καὶ τῶν Κάτλων ἐνδοξότερον ἀποδείξει. And these smaller data in this *vita* seem to have been in great measure communicated by the orator to his secretary and biographer *in spe*, Tullius Tiro. Cicero, I say, declined equestrian matches for his daughter, in this point refusing to follow the suggestions of his bosom friend.

The consulate was still laid in the cradles of the aristocracy.—It is ridiculous, Cicero complained, (Verr. 5, 181) with what ease they attain to the honors of the state: “ad quos per ludum et per negligentiam pervenistis”. Early in 55 B. C. Cicero wrote to Atticus (4, 8b, 2) of the consular candidacy of Domitius: “quid enim hoc miserius, quam eum, qui tot annos quot habet, designatus consul fuerit, fieri consullem non posse”? Of course, Ferrero must maintain his thesis of “una aristocrazia in dissoluzione” (I 185), and the less of positive detail he can bring forward, the more impressive, and for the uninformed reader the more authoritative, are these superb and sweeping generalizations, while his use of *tutto* and *sempre* is wonderful.—Lucullus is furbished up to be the “creator” of Roman imperialism, which indeed antedated Lucullus much. Ferrero cannot be very familiar with the Roman spirit and character.

The characterization of Cato (I 371–372) is painfully inadequate. Evidently the author has no first hand knowledge of the Stoic system and his references to Ancient Philosophy are as a rule merely declamatory and sophomoric; e. g. (I 202) when Aristotle is called a veritable Cyclopaedia for the Romans—generalizations made quite untenable by the ascertainable facts of Cicero's life.

The *prooemia* of Cicero's philosophical books show how stony a soil true philosophy had among the Romans. To this add the notable passage, in a letter from Cicero in Cilicia to Cato (in January 50 B. C., Fam. 15, 4, 16) speaking of their mutual interest in philosophy: "Haec igitur, *quae mihi tecum communis est*, societas studiorum atque artium nostrarum, quibus a pueritia dediti ac devincti *soli propemodum nos* philosophiam veram illam et antiquam, quae quibusdam otii esse ac desidia videtur, in forum atque in rem publicam atque in ipsam aciem paene deduximus". . . . .

What authority has F. for saying that Catiline's task (viz. to accomplish the abolition of debt) was *easy* or would have been *easy* (I 308). The Twelve Tables and all the vast interlacing structure of the Civil Law reared upon them, the jurisdiction of the praetor urbanus,—all these things, the very root and fibre of things Roman, were a mighty bulwark against repudiation.

The character of Crassus is simply abstracted (how easy!) from the bankers' type of to-day. (I 271) "*invice Crasso era diffidente, come uno vero banchiere*". A recent writer says aptly: "Die Darstellung der Quellen, die in jedem Satze die Farben *ihrer Zeit* tragen, gewissermassen einen Zeitgeruch ausströmen, versetzt unmittelbar in die Epoche aus welcher sie stammen . . . . . und verhindert so die FAELSCHLICHE UEBERTRAGUNG DER EIGENEN ZEIT in die entfernte Vergangenheit".—Clodius and the Bona Dea intrigue. Cicero (fragm. 5 in Clodium et Curionem) scornfully describes Clodius' preparation for this adventure, assuming female garb. At once, *proprio motu* Signor Ferrero generalizes (I 418): "it was one of his greatest pleasures to dress like a woman"—that Clodius was effeminate in tastes: he was probably a somewhat robust malefactor. Clodius is brought into the psychiatric waiting room and a proper diagnosis is made out. Lombroso is cited in a footnote.

E. G. SIHLER.